

What Happened to the Jews of Medina

This is the story of the tragic end of the Jews of Medina. A case of ethnic cleansing, betrayal and genocide carried out by the Messenger of Allah (PBUH). The prophet raided the 2000 year old Jewish communities of Medina, killed their men, confiscated their properties, enslaved their wives and children and banished the unwanted with no provocation on the part of the Jews. The holy Prophet's sole motive was greed for their wealth and lust for their women.

It is difficult for us to find the truth about what really happened to the Jewish inhabitants of Medina at the time of Muhammad. There are no independent sources and the Jews who were eventually exterminated by Muhammad left nothing for us to refer to. We are left only with the Muslim historians' version, which obviously tell the story tainted with their fanatical faith to their prophet and their hatred of the Jews that is conspicuous in every sentence they wrote about them.

Many Muslim apologists downplay the importance and the number of the Jews of Medina. Dr. A. Zahoor and Dr. Z. Haq writes, "History does not record much as to when first Jewish migration from north to Yathrib (Medina) began as their numbers remained small throughout their stay there. (1)

Despite the fact that there are no independent sources by digging into the writings of the Muslim scholars and reading between the lines one can find some glimpses of what really happened here and there. Maududi, in his comments on the Surah 59 of Quran (2) reporting from *Kitab al-Aghani*, [a book of songs, an important source for information on medieval Islamic society, vol. xix, p. 94, by Abu al-Faraj Ali of Esfahan (897-967)] writes.

Jewish settlement in Hijaz

"The Jews of the Hejaz claimed that they had come to settle in Arabia during the last stage of the life of the Prophet Moses (peace be upon him). They said that the Prophet Moses had dispatched an army to expel the Amalekites from the land of Yathrib and had commanded it not to spare even a single soul of that tribe. The Israelite army carried out the Prophet's command, but spared the life of a handsome prince of the Amalekite king and returned with him to Palestine. By that time the Prophet Moses had passed away. His successors took great exception to what the army had done, for by sparing the life of an Amalekite it had clearly disobeyed the Prophet and violated the Mosaic Law. Consequently, they excluded the army from their community, and it had to return to Yathrib and settle there forever. Thus the Jews claimed that they had been living in Yathrib since about 1200 B.C.

The second Jewish immigration, according to the Jews, took place in 587 BC. when Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, destroyed Jerusalem and dispersed the Jews throughout the world. The Arab Jews said that several of their tribes at that time had come to settle in Wadi al-Qura, Taima, and Yathrib.(Al-Baladhuri, *Futuh al-Buldan*)."

Maududi rejects both these claims and says that "these have in fact no historical basis and probably the Jews had invented this story in order to overawe the Arabs into believing that they were of noble lineage and the original inhabitants of the land."

However he maintains, “what is established is that when in A.D. 70 the Romans massacred the Jews in Palestine, and then in A.D. 132 expelled them from that land, many of the Jewish tribes fled to find an asylum in the Hejaz, a territory that was contiguous to Palestine in the south. There, they settled wherever they found water springs and greenery, and then by intrigue and through money lending business gradually occupied the fertile lands. Ailah, Maqna, Tabuk, Taima, Wadi al Qura, Fadak and Khaiber came under their control in that very period, and Bani Quraizah, Bani al-Nadir, Bani Bahdal, and Bani Qainuqa also came in the same period and occupied Yathrib.”

Since there are no compelling historical evidences for us to accept Maududi’s version of the History we may as well conclude that Muslims (perhaps Maududi himself) invented this story in order to undermine “the noble lineage of the Jews as the original inhabitants of Yathrib”. It seems that the Jews, who were well established in Yathrib and by the very admission of Maududi were “practically the owners of this green and fertile land” (2) had little use for making such false claim about their origin. On the other hand Muslims whose enmity of the Jews dates back to the time of Muhammad and even a reputed scholar like Maududi cannot contain his hatred of them when he writes about them, are more likely to invent false stories to justify their expulsion and their ethnic cleansing of the Jews from their homeland.

No matter what, Muslim historians admit that the Arab Jews, were living in Yathrib for centuries. “In the matter of language, dress, civilization and way of life they had completely adopted Arabism, even their names had become Arabian. Of the 12 Jewish tribes that had settled in Hejaz, none except the Bani Zaura retained its Hebrew name. Except for a few scattered scholars none knew Hebrew. In fact, there is nothing in the poetry of the Jewish poets of the pre-Islamic days to distinguish it from the poetry of the Arab poets in language, ideas and themes. They even inter-married with the Arabs. In fact, nothing distinguished them from the common Arabs except religion. Because of this Arabism the western orientalists have been misled into thinking that perhaps they were not really Israelites but Arabs who had embraced Judaism, or that at least majority of them consisted of the Arab Jews.” (2)

Western orientalists may not be that far from the truth after all. Because even if originally the Jews migrated to Arabia, after centuries, or if we believe in the Jewish version of the history, close to 2000 years of intermarrying with Arabs, they must have become Arabs for all intent and purposes.

Maududi writes, “No authentic history of the Arabian Jews exists in the world. They have not left any writing of their own in the form of a book or a tablet which might throw light on their past, nor have the Jewish historians and writers of the non-Arab world made any mention of them, the reason being that after their settlement in the Arabian peninsula they had detached themselves from the main body of the nation, and the Jews of the world did not count them as among themselves. For they had given up Hebrew culture and language, even the names, and adopted Arabism instead.” (2)

Another reason that no authentic history of the Arabian Jews exists is because Muhammad exterminated all of them. Dead people are not known to write history.

If the Jews were so Arabianized that they were indistinguishable from the rest of the Arabs, then perhaps the Jewish version of the history is more accurate and the Jews had settled in Arabia much earlier than the Muslim historians are willing to admit. But even if we had to accept the Muslim version of the history, we learn that these Jews made Arabia their home

500 years before the birth of Muhammad and they were as much entitled to their land (Yathrib) as anyone is to his native land.

Other non-Jewish settlers.

In A. D. 450 or 451, a great flood in Yaman forced different tribes of the people of Saba to migrate to other parts of Arabia. Among them Aus and the Khazraj went to settle in Yathrib. These two were big tribes yet they were unskilled people. Unlike the Jews who practically were the master of all trades, and the owners of most businesses, Arabs in Yathrib made their living serving the Jews in their farms and households. They were looked down at, by their Jewish masters and this was the cause of resentment

Yet these two tribes could not see eye to eye and each sought the alliance of one of the Jewish tribes. This worked out well; since the Bani Qainuqa, was not on friendly terms with the other two Jewish tribes also. So Bani Qainuqa and Khazraj formed an alliance together and Bani Quraizah, Bani al-Nadir and Aus Joined their strength together. It is important to note that these feuds were not religiously motivated but were tribal skirmishes.

Maududi comments, "Because of this they (the Jews) had not only to take part in the mutual wars of the Arabs but they often had to go to war in support of the Arab tribe to which their tribe was tied in alliance against another Jewish tribe which was allied to the enemy tribe."

If we could see through the tick fog of prejudice that has shortened the vision of Muslim scholars, we can see, these tribes living in Medina were all Arabs, practicing different religions. And just as other tribes and nations anywhere in the world they had their skirmishes, but as the structure of their alliances suggest, their conflicts were not religiously motivated. This is extremely important. Tribal skirmishes are short lived but religious hatred never dies. It transcends time and space. As we shall see later, it was Muhammad who introduced the religious hatred. It is him who should be credited as the founder of religious intolerance in Arabia and perhaps the entire world. Muhammad is often hailed as the man who united warring Arab tribes. That may be true. But without him these tribes would have put aside their conflicts sooner or later, one way or another, just as other feuding tribes did eventually in other parts of the world. Almost everywhere, formerly hostile tribes have joined together to form stronger nations. Muhammad united the Arabs and turned them into a mighty force, which invaded other countries, devastating other civilizations and imposing their own language, culture and religion.

By embracing Islam Arabs benefited economically from their unity, yet the harm of religious hatred that Muhammad inflicted upon the entire humanity for centuries has outweighed all the good that the unity of few desert dwellers of Arabia might have brought to them.

Migration to Medina

Arabs were always at war with each other. But among them, Meccans had an envious position. Ka'ba, the holy place of all the Arabs was in Mecca. It was a place for pilgrimage and that meant power and money for Meccans.

When Abu Talib, Muhammad's uncle and Khadija, his wife died he lost two of his most powerful supporters and the people of Mecca increased their hostility towards him. He recalled the offer of few men from Thaif who had told him if he made their town the holy place of his new religion, thus making it the religious and the commercial hub of his followers, the Bani Thaqif, people of Taif, might support his cause. So he and his adoptive

son Zaid ibn Harith secretly went to Taif in 620 C.E. (Common Era) seeking the alliance of its inhabitants and promising them to make their city the holy place for the Muslims. But instead the Bani Thaqif mocked him and even his plea to keep their visit a secret was not granted. The leaders of Taif may have envied Mecca's religious prestige but they did not wish to jeopardise their comfortable life for a risky adventure with an obscure religious pretender.

When the Quraish learned of this they were enraged and they escalated their hostility to Muhammad until a couple of years later they decided to assassinate him.

Muhammad learned of the plot against his life and escaped to Yathrib. In Yathrib he had some followers. They belonged to both Khazraj and Aus. These two tribes were weary of constant fighting and especially of a recent Battle (Bu'ath) that occurred among them. They were looking for a way to end the hostilities. So the leaders of both parties accepted Muhammad to act as the mediator among them.

The Treaty

It was an Arab custom and it is also practiced everywhere else, even to this day, that two feuding parties agree on someone to act as the arbitrator. Muhammad who was at first considered to be an outsider and therefore impartial was called to act as an arbitrator in one of these conflicts. It is important to note that the conflict in Yathrib was not between Muslims and Jews; otherwise Muhammad could not have acted as the arbitrator. Also as we saw earlier there were no religious disagreements in Yathrib. However Jews were part of the treaty because of their alliances with the Arab tribes.

This must have been a golden opportunity in the prophetic carrier of Muhammad, which changed his fortune and turned the odds in his favour. As part of the pledge, they were to protect the Prophet as they would protect their women and children if he were attacked by the Meccans.

The numbers of the Muslims in Yathrib grow thanks to the tolerance of the Jews and their error in giving the immigrants a safe haven. Jews did not foresee that the man to whom they give asylum today would be so ungrateful that would turn against them and eventually would be the cause of their destruction.

The treaty did not give Muslims a mandate to govern. Ibn Hisham reports part of that treaty. But as we shall see this treaty must have been forged. It states.

"The Jews must bear their expenses and the Muslims their expenses. Each must help the other against anyone who attacks the people of this document. They must seek mutual advice and consultation, and loyalty is a protection against treachery. They shall sincerely wish one another well. Their relations will be governed by piety and recognition of the rights of others, and not by sin and wrongdoing. The wronged must be helped. The Jews must pay with the believers so long as the war lasts. Yathrib shall be a sanctuary for the people of this document. If any dispute or controversy likely to cause trouble should arise, it must be referred to God and to Muhammad the Apostle of God; Quraish and their helpers shall not be given protection. The contracting parties are bound to help one another against any attack on Yathrib; Every one shall be responsible for the defence of the portion to which he belongs" (*Ibn Hisham*, vol. ii, pp. 147 to 150).

There are several clues that make us realize that this treaty is altered. The most obvious is that the Jews could not have signed a document, which would have acknowledged Muhammad to be the Apostle of God. This would have meant acceptance of Muhammad's claim by the Jews, which obviously never happened. So the above document is most likely forged. Also there are contradictions in the context of the document. It starts as a treaty signed by two sovereign nations (tribes) with equal rights and powers. However the phrases "The Jews must pay with the believers so long as the war lasts" and "If any dispute or controversy likely to cause trouble should arise, it must be referred to God and to Muhammad the Apostle of God," contradict that notion of equality.

These sentences are more likely inserted later. They give Muslims superiority, which is in conflict with the rest of the document that gives an impression of an agreement between two equals. But the most important point is how could Muhammad be the arbitrator if he is the beneficiary in this treaty? It is amazing that Muslim scholars have read this document for centuries and it has never occurred to them to ask how could Muhammad be the arbitrator if he is part of the treaty? But that is exactly the point. A religious mind is shackled. Although they would laugh if a similar story is said about another group, they do not seem to have any difficulty accepting it when it is about their own religion.

These are telltales that the above treaty is not authentic. Yet, since Muhammad and his ready-to-assassin followers destroyed the real document, along with the Jews who were a part of that treaty, we are left with nothing, but this lame document to find the truth. Which makes our task not unlike trying to find a needle in a haystack.

Holy Wars!

After the incident of Badr that Muhammad's men ambushed a merchant caravan, and brought the booty his fortunes changed. He was enriched by the stolen booty, and his popularity grew. He promised wealth and slave girls to those who took part in his armed robberies and paradise with houries and rivers of wine to those who were killed. For an ignorant fanatic and at the same time greedy Arab this was a proposition hard to resist. If he survived he would have his share of booty including women and if he died he would go to paradise and have more of the same plus the pleasure of Allah. It is interesting that the Arabs had some kind of decency when they captured married women but the prophet of Allah did away with that decency and proclaimed that it is lawful for a man to have sexual intercourse with a woman captured in war. ([Q. 4: 24](#)) Jews, having a religion of their own, could not accept Muhammad's pretentious claim of prophethood. They probably derided at him and at his followers. This is perfectly understandable. How would Muslims react, if someone in their midst call himself a messenger of God and start a new religion? Does the persecution of the Baha'is give us a clue?

- 1) <http://users.erols.com/zenithco/treaty22.html#note1>
- 2) <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/maududi/mau59.html>

By: Ali Sina

What Muhammad did to the Jews?

Banu Qaynuqa

The Invasion of Banu Qainuqa

There were three Jewish tribes living in Medina, the Banu Qainuqa, the Bani Nadir and the Bani Quraiza. Each of these tribes had alliances with other Arab tribes and if there were skirmishes between their Arab allies and the other Jewish tribes they would have sided with their Arab friends. This is the proof that in Medina prior to Islam there were no religious strifes. All the religious intolerance was introduced by the Prophet.

When the Prophet entered Medina, he was hopeful that the Jews would accept his religion. He was preaching the same god of the Jews, approving of their prophets and telling their stories. He had chosen their holy land as his qibla (point of adoration) and was hounding them for their allegiance.

W. N. ARAFAT who denies the first holocaust writes; "It is also generally accepted that at first the Prophet Muhammad hoped that the Jews of Yathrib, as followers of a divine religion, would show understanding of the new monotheistic religion, Islam." (1)

But to his dismay the Jews, just like the Quraish, ridiculed him and paid little heed to his calling. After his hopes were shattered and his patience vexed the Prophet grew hostile towards the Jews and it became evident that he would one day take his revenge.

INVASION OF BANI QAYNUQA:

The first group of the Jews that fell under the wrath of the Prophet were the Banu Qaynuqa. They lived in quarters within Madinah named after them. As for jobs, they took up goldsmithery, blacksmithing and crafts of making household instruments, that is why war weaponry was available in large quantities in their houses.

Saifur Rahman al-Mubarakpuri in AR-Raheeq Al-Makhtum writes: "They (the Banu Qaynuqa) started a process of trouble-making, jeering at the Muslims, hurting those who frequented their bazaars, and even intimidating their women. Such things began to aggravate the general situation, so the Prophet (Peace be upon him) gathered them in assemblage, admonished and called them to be rational, sensible and guided and cautioned against further

transgression. Nevertheless they remained obdurate and paid no heed to his warning, and said: "Don't be deluded on account of defeating some Quraishites inexperienced in the art of war. If you were to engage us in fight, you will realize that we are genuine war experts." (2)

Whatever those few Jews retorted to Muhammad, it was not the official voice of the whole population. But for a man looking for an excuse to strike it was a golden opportunity. Maududi says, "This was in clear words a declaration of war."

But it wasn't. These words did not come from the chief of the Bani Qainuqa and they were not threatening. They were shouted down by a bunch of hooligans, to someone who tried to bully them while they were acting on the instructions of their own religion and took a life for a life. Only one whose brain is numbed by his religious fanaticism can interpret the defiant words of a few youth as the declaration of war made by the entire Jews against Muslims. It is the ultimate injustice to punish an entire population with such severity with the pretext that few of them killed one man in retaliation of him killing one of theirs. That is despite the verse that says "... no bearer of burdens can bear the burden of another" ([Q. 53: 38](#))

The Muslim historians want to blame it all on the Jews and depict them as the villains of the story. Jeering, however is not a crime. But by paying a little attention to the response of the Jews to the Prophet it is not difficult to see that he did not go there to counsel them but to threaten them.

The following verse that was issued for that occasion reveals the hostile tone of the Prophet when he met the Jews.

"Say [O Muhammad] to those who disbelieve: 'You will be defeated and gathered together to Hell, and worst indeed is that place to rest.' There has already been a Sign for you (O Jews) in the two armies that met (in combat – i.e. the battle of Badr): One was fighting in the cause of Allâh, and as for the other (they) were disbelievers. They (the believers) saw them (the disbelievers) with their own eyes twice their number (although they were thrice their number). And Allâh supports with His Victory whom He pleases. Verily, in this is a lesson for those who understand." [[Q. 3: 22,13](#)]

"One day a Jewish goldsmith provoked a Muslim woman whose genitals became uncovered when he had tied the edge of the garment to her back. A Muslim man happened to be there and killed the man; the Jews retaliated by killing that Muslim. The man's family called the Muslims for help and war started." (2)

Incidents like these often happen in primitive societies. As a matter of fact even in very civilized societies many people are killed over something as trivial

as road rage. Humans are not completely rational beings. Most people react in a very unpredictable way often with dire consequences. Any wise man, in similar situations would have eased the tension and would have calmed the mob without taking sides. But Muhammad was far from it. Already emboldened by his plundering of the passing caravans, he had his eyes on the wealth of the Jews in Yathrib and was looking for an excuse to make his move. This incident presented the golden opportunity that the Prophet was waiting for and On Saturday, Shawwal 15th, 2 A.H., he marched out with his soldiers, and laid siege to the Jews' forts for 15 days. Without the water, the Bani Qainuqa was forced to surrender and defer to the Prophet's judgement on their lives, wealth, women and children.

Maududi writes, "Consequently, the Holy Prophet (upon whom be Allah's peace) laid siege to their quarters towards the end of Shawwal (and according to some others, of Dhi Qa'dah) A. H. 2. The siege had hardly lasted for a fortnight when they surrendered and all their fighting men were tied and taken prisoners. Now Abdullah bin Ubayy came up in support of them and insisted that they should be pardoned. The Holy Prophet conceded his request and decided that the Bani Qainuqa would be exiled from Madinah leaving their properties, armour and tools of trade behind. (Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Hisham, Tarikh Tabari). (3)

The details of Ubayy's intercession with the Prophet is reported in the first Islamic history book, Sirat.

"Asim b. 'Umar b. Qatada said that the B. Qaynuqa' were the first of the Jews to break their agreement with the apostle and to go to war, between Badr and Uhud, and the apostle besieged them until they surrendered unconditionally. 'Abdullah b. Ubayy b. Salul went to him when God had put them in his power and said, 'O Muhammad, deal kindly with my clients' (now they were allies of Khazraj), but the apostle put him off. He repeated the words, and the apostle turned away from him, whereupon he thrust his hand into the collar of the apostle's robe; the apostle was so angry that his face became almost black. He said, 'Confound you, let me go.' He answered, 'No, by God, I will not let you go until you deal kindly with my clients. Four hundred men without mail and three hundred mailed protected me from all mine enemies; would you cut them down in one morning? By God, I am a man who fears that circumstances may change.' The apostle said, 'You can have them.' [Sirat, p. 363]

In the words of al-Mubarakpuri "Banu Qainuqa' handed over all materials, wealth and war equipage to the Prophet (Peace be upon him), who set aside one fifth and distributed the rest to his men. After that they were banished out of all Arabia to Azru'a in Syria where they stayed for a while and soon perished away." (2)

No one ever asked, why? Why a trivial incident should become the excuse for the envoy of God to banish a whole population and confiscate their entire belongings. The scene of the exiles from Kosovo is too fresh in our memories yet even Milosovic who is now a war criminal did not put hand on the properties of the refugees. And the Jews did not have a UN refugee camp set for them out of Medina with Red Cross and other humanitarian organizations waiting to alleviate their pain. How any decent human being could justify these ruthless genocidal acts of the Prophet? How can any person call himself a Muslims after learning these historic truth about Muhammad? The fact that Abdullah bin Ubayy, whom al-Mubarakpuri does not hesitate to call a "hypocrite" came to the prisoner's support pleading that they be pardoned demonstrates that Muhammad's original plan was to execute them all. It was bin Ubayy's intervention that saved their lives. How is it that a "hypocrite" was more compassionate than the Messenger of Allah and Allah himself? Wasn't he a superior man to Muhammad?

By Ali Sina

1- From Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, (1976), pp. 100-107 By W. N. ARAFAT

<http://homepages.hajq.com.au/salam/misc/qurayza.html>

2- AR-Raheeq Al-Makhtum by Saifur Rahman al-Mubarakpuri

<http://islamweb.islam.gov.qa/english/sira/raheek/PAGE-26.HTM>

3- <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/maududi/mau59.html>

The Invasion of Bani Nadir

Bani Nadir

BANI AN-NADIR INVASION:

Next it was the turn of the Bani Nadeer. This was another tribe of the Jews of Medina. Ka'b Ibn Ashraf, the chief of the Bani Nadeer became concerned of the safety of his tribe after witnessing the fate of the Banu Qaynuqa and how the Prophet eliminated them with no excuse at all. He realized that Muhammad

would stop at nothing to eradicate the Jews. It became clear to him that the Prophet was a ruthless man with no mercy, no conscience and no principles. He would kill innocent people with no qualms. Ka'b knew that he had to do something to protect his people. That is why he started to communicate with the Meccans and seek protection from them in the case that Muslims decided to invade his people.

Ka'b bin Ashraf, the chief of the Bani an-Nadeer, "a wealthy man known for his handsomeness, and a poet, went to Makkah" Says Maududi, "and incited the people to vengeance by writing and reciting provocative elegies for the Quraish chiefs killed at Badr. Then he returned to Madinah and composed lyrical verses of an insulting nature about the Muslim women. At last, enraged with his mischief, the Holy Prophet (upon whom be Allah's peace) sent Muhammad bin Maslamah Ansari in Rabi al-Awwal, A. H. 3, and had him slain." (*Ibn Sad, Ibn Hisham, Tabari*).

What should a responsible chief do when he sees that a whole population of a tribe like his was ambushed with no provocation by an emerging tyrant, and banished from their homeland despite of their treaty? Although Muslims say that it was the Jews who broke the treaty, their own very historical texts, clearly demonstrates that Muhammad is the one to be blamed for such breach of the covenant. If the stories written by Muslims are true, Ka'b bin Ashraf had no other choice but to go to Mecca and seek assistance for his people's protection. Muhammad, by virtue of what he did to Bani Qaynuqa, was not a man to be trusted. What bin Ashraf did was no crime. He was a chieftain concerned about the safety of his own people. His crime was writing poetry. Nothing justifies Muhammad sending an assassin to kill him traitorously in the middle of the night. Not his contacts with the Meccans and not his "poems satirizing Muhammad" or "eulogizing Quraish". There is no justification in assassinating those who do not agree with you. Muslim apologists are not ashamed of Muhammad's assassinations and approve anything he did without thinking. They say that by cowardly assassinating his enemies, Muhammad was saving lives. This demonstrates how religion drains the intelligence of its victims who otherwise are normal people. How these diehard Muslim apologists justify Muhammad's assassination of Abu Afak, a 120 year old man and Asma bint Marwan a poetess and a mother of five small children whose only crime was to compose lyrics offensive to his holiness prophet of Allah. In what ways he was superior to Saddam Hussein, Bin Laden or for that matter any gangster? Isn't the assassination of the Journalists, writers and the intellectuals by the Islamic Republic of Iran and other Islamic regimes inspired by what the holy Prophet did to his critics?

The story of Ka'b's assassination is recorded in the following hadith.

BUKHARI, VOLUME 5, #369

Narrated Jabir Abdullah:

Allah's messenger said "Who is willing to kill Ka` b bin al-Ashraf who has hurt Allah and His apostle?" Thereupon Maslama got up saying, "O Allah's messenger! Would you like that I kill him?" The prophet said, "Yes". Maslama said, "Then allow me to say a (false) thing (i.e. to deceive Ka` b). The prophet said, "You may say it."

Maslama went to Ka` b and said, "That man (i.e. Muhammad) demands Sadaqa (i.e. Zakat) [taxes] from us, and he has troubled us, and I have come to borrow something from you." On that, Ka` b said, "By Allah, you will get tired of him!" Maslama said, "Now as we have followed him, we do not want to leave him unless and until we see how his end is going to be. Now we want you to lend us a camel load or two of food." Ka` b said, "Yes, but you should mortgage something to me." Maslama and his companion said, "What do you want?" Ka` b replied, "Mortgage your women to me." They said, "How can we mortgage our women to you and you are the most handsome of the Arabs?" Ka` b said, "Then mortgage your sons to me." They said, "How can we mortgage our sons to you? Later they would be abused by the people's saying that so and so has been mortgaged for a camel load of food. That would cause us great disgrace, but we will mortgage our arms to you."

Maslama and his companion promised Ka` b that Maslama would return to him. He came to Ka` b at night along with Ka` b's foster brother, Abu Na'ila. Ka` b invited them to come into his fort and then he went down to them. His wife asked him, "Where are you going at this time?" Ka` b replied, None but Maslama and my (foster) brother Abu Na'ila have come." His wife said, "I hear a voice as if blood is dropping from him." Ka` b said, "They are none by my brother Maslama and my foster brother Abu Na'ila. A generous man should respond to a call at night even if invited to be killed."

Maslama went with two men. So Maslama went in together with two men, and said to them, "When Ka` b comes, I will touch his hair and smell it, and when you see that I have got hold of his head, strike him. I will let you smell his head."

Ka` b bin al-Ashraf came down to them wrapped in his clothes, and diffusing perfume. Maslama said, "I have never smelt a better scent than this." Ka` b replied, "I have got the best Arab women who know how to use the high class of perfume." Maslama requested Ka` b "Will you allow me to smell your head?" Ka` b said "yes." Maslama smelt it and made his companions smell it as well. Then he requested Ka` b again, "Will you let me (smell your head)??" Ka` b said "Yes". When Maslama got a strong hold of him, he said (to his companions) "Get at

him!" So they killed him and went to the prophet and informed him."

This story becomes more intriguing as it evolves. Maududi continues with his narrative and says "For some time after these punitive measures (i. e. the banishment of the Qainuqa and killing of Ka'b bin Ashraf) the Jews remained so terror stricken that they did not dare commit any further mischief. But later when in Shawwal, A. H. 3, the Quraish in order to avenge themselves for the defeat at Badr, marched against Madinah with great preparations, and the Jews saw that only a thousand men had marched out with the Holy Prophet (upon whom be Allah's peace) as against three thousand men of the Quraish, and even they were deserted by 300 hypocrites who returned to Madinah, they committed the first and open breach of the treaty by refusing to join the Holy Prophet in the defence of the city although they were bound to it."

It is amazing that Muslims expected collaboration from Bani Nadeer after assassinating their charming leader and completely destroying their brethrens, the Bani Qaynuqa. Muhammad proved to be a ruthless tyrant that would stop at nothing. He would order the assassination of his enemies and next day appear in the mosque reciting prayers as if nothing had happened and praise the killer. He would have no mercy on a 120-year-old man or a nursing woman with five small children to take care of. He would look for an excuse to lash out on an entire population confiscate their belongings and banish them from their homes. If it weren't for someone else's intervention he would have had no qualms executing thousands of Bani Qaynuqa. As Maududi brags these poor Jews were terror stricken and must have asked themselves when would be their turn? And yet the Muslims call them traitors for not willing to fight alongside them after they had killed their chieftain. Wasn't killing Ka'b ibn Ashraf and exiling the Bani Qaynuqa the breach of the contract? Or perhaps Muhammad thought that the treaty is only one sided and while obliges the Jews to observe it, he was free to do as he pleased!

Maududi narrates the story of Muhammad's meeting with the Bani Nadeer thus: "Then, when in the Battle of Uhud the Muslims suffered reverses, they were further emboldened. So much so that the Bani an-Nadir made a secret plan to kill the Holy Prophet (upon whom be Allah's peace) though the plan failed before it could be executed. According to the details, after the incident of Bi'r Maunah (Safar, A. H. 4) Amr bin Umayyah Damri slew by mistake two men of the Bani Amir in retaliation, who actually belonged to a tribe, which was allied to the Muslims, but Amr had mistaken them for the men of the enemy. Because of this mistake their blood money became obligatory on the Muslims. Since the Bani an-Nadir were also a party in the alliance with the Bani Amir, the Holy Prophet (upon whom be Allah's peace) went to their clan along with some of his

Companions to ask for their help in paying the blood money. Outwardly they agreed to contribute, as he wished, but secretly they plotted that a person should go up to the top of the house by whose wall the Holy Prophet was sitting and drop a rock on him to kill him. But before they could execute their plan, Allah informed him in time and he immediately got up and returned to Madinah."

What an absurdity! First of all Muhammad already broke any treaty when he assassinated Ka'b bin Ashraf. He already broke all treaties when he confiscated the belongings of the Banu Qaynuqa and banished them on foot in the desert. Now that his assassins, by mistake killed someone else, of which Banu Nadeer had no fault he wanted them to pay for his crimes. Treaties are not made to bail out the criminal activities of the other party. The treaty was to defend Yathrib from the invasion of the enemies. Muhammad's crimes and his gangster activities was not the subject of the treaty. It is unconscionable that intelligent human beings become so dumb to read this story for 1400 years and none of them pause for a second and think. Could you even imagine if the same story was repeated today between two nations that have signed a joint treaty? Let us assume that the president of one of these countries was so low that like Muhammad he decided to eliminate his enemies through assassination, would it be conceivable if he came to his ally and demand to bail him out for his criminal mistakes?

In this story, apparently Muhammad goes to the Bani Nadeer and makes his demand. These terrified Jews of course knew that the treaty did not mean that they should bail out for Muhammad's crime acticities and blunders. But they were too weak and too frightened to oppose the emerging tyrant, so they agreed. But this was not what the Prophet of Allah had in mind. He was hoping that they reject him so that he gets an excuse to deal with them the way he dealt with the Banu Qaynuqa. Bani Nadeer had the best-cultivated land in Yathrib. Muhammad had his eyes on their plantations and farms. [Bukhari](#)

[Volume 9, Book 92, Number 447](#) He was just getting his taste of power and he loved it. So he had to come up with an excuse. When Bani Nadeer disappointed him and agreed with his request. He needed a pretext to act upon his plan and confiscate the properties of these wealthy Jews. There again, the prophet of Allah had a new "inspiration". It was a brilliant idea. He told his companions that the Jews had plotted to kill him. His followers believed him when he told them of his Miiraj in the company of Gabriele. They had no difficulty believing whatever to believe in any absurdity that he concocted.

Al-Mubarakpouri writes; "Once the Prophet (Peace be upon him) with some of his Companions set out to see Banu Nadeer and seek their help in raising the blood-money he had to pay to Bani Kalb for the two men that 'Amr bin Omaiyah Ad-Damari had killed by mistake. All of that was in accordance with the clauses

of the treaty that both parties had already signed. On hearing his story they said they would share in paying the blood-money and asked him and his Companions Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Ali and others to sit under a wall of their houses and wait. The Jews held a short private meeting and conspired to kill the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The most wicked among them, 'Amr bin Jahsh, volunteered to climb up the wall and drop a large millstone on his head. One of them, Salam bin Mashkam, cautioned them against perpetrating such a crime, predicting that Allâh would divulge their plot to him, and added that such an act would constitute a manifest violation of the pact concluded with the Muslims.

In fact, Gabriel did come down to reveal to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) their wicked criminal intention, so he, with his Companions, hurried off back to Madinah. On their way, he told his Companions of the Divine Revelation."

Of course Bani Nadeer was part of the treaty that the Prophet signed with the Medinans but the treaty was to fight against the Meccans if they attacked Medina and not to pay for assassination mishaps of the messenger of Allah. Yet interestingly, despite the absurdity of this demand and despite the fact that the Prophet had assassinated their leader, the Bani Nadeer agreed to pay the ransom. They knew Muhammad and did not want to give him an excuse to exterminate them like he did with the Bani Qaynuqa. They knew that any rejection would mean their death and had no choice but to accept this unjust levy.

But the Prophet who apparently wished they decline this absurd demand and therefore use it as an excuse to declare war against them was disappointed at their complacency. The messenger of Allah, really had no other purpose than to find an excuse and exterminate the Bani Naeer.

The Prophet who believed that God is khairul maakereen, "the best of the deceivers", was himself a cunning man. The story of Gabriel informing him of the plot of the Jews against his life is as credible as his visits of the hell and heaven in the night of Mi'raj or his other fantasy tales of his encounters with Jinns and Satan. It would make us doubt his sanity or his sincerity but his easy to fleece followers would actually believe him and would go killing innocent people for the lies he counted them.

The truth is that it was not the Jews who breached the treaty but it was Muhammad who broke it and along with it he broke the very cords of human decency. He broke the norms of humanity, the human morality, the laws of compassion, the rules of Justice, the standards of ethics and violated the principles of goodness. The Prophet of Allah {peace be upon him} took away the peace from the people who crossed his way and for 1400 years plunged humanity into never ending wars. He instigated hatred in the world and among his

followers that is consuming them and the rest of humanity.

The above story raises few more logical questions. If these Jews really wanted to kill Muhammad, couldn't they easily capture and kill him along with his companions? Why drop a stone when he and his companions were already in their hands? And why a God who could inform his beloved prophet of a plot against him did not make 'Amr bin Jahsh to fall to his death? This could have saved his prophet and the entire Jewish population. Didn't God know that his messenger has no mercy and no compassion for the lives of thousands of innocent people and he would make all pay for the crime of a few? If God was so angry of these Jews that he did not care about them any more, why he himself did not kill them with a disease. Why he did not order the Earth to open its belly, as a story if Bible says (numbers; 16:30) and devour them all? It certainly would have been much easier on them and on the Muslims. Why a loving God would ask his devoted servants to act like common murderers and ruthless killers? Only people blinded by faith do not cringe by hearing these stories. To every reasonable person it is obvious that Muhammad made up the whole thing to continue with his plans of ethnic cleansing and plundering.

Maududi finished this story by saying, "Now there was no question of showing them any further concession. The Holy Prophet at once sent to them the ultimatum that the treachery they had meditated against him had come to his knowledge; therefore, they were to leave Madinah within ten days; if anyone of them was found staying behind in their quarters, he would be put to the sword. Meanwhile Abdullah bin Ubayy sent them the message that he would help them with two thousand men and that the Bani Quraizah and Bani Ghatafan also would come to their aid; therefore, they should stand firm and should not go. On this false assurance they responded to the Holy Prophet's ultimatum saying that they would not leave Madinah and he could do whatever was in his power. Consequently, in Rabi' al-Awwal, A. H. 4, the Holy Prophet (upon whom be Allah's peace) laid siege to them, and after a few days of the siege (which according to some traditions were 6 and according to others 15 days) they agreed to leave Madinah on the condition that they could retain all their property which they could carry on their camels, except the armor. Thus, Madinah was rid of this second mischievous tribe of Jews. Only two of the Bani an-Nadeer became Muslims and stayed behind. Others went to Syria and Khaiber."

Muhammad did not massacre the Bani Nadeer as he did the Banu Qurayza, another Jewish tribe residing in Medina but the thought have surely came to him as we can see from the following extract from Sirat.

"Concerning B. al-Nadir the Sura of Exile came down in which is recorded how God wreaked His vengeance on them and gave His apostle power over them and how He dealt with them. God said: 'He it is who turned out those who

disbelieved of the scripture people from their homes to the first exile. ... 'So consider this, you who have understanding. Had not God prescribed deportation against them,' which was vengeance from God, 'He would have punished them in this world,' ([Q. 59: 3](#)) i.e. with the sword, 'and in the next world there would be the punishment of hell' as well." [Sirat, p. 438]

There is a verse from Quran that speaks about this event confirming Muhammad's actions in killing them and taking them as prisoners.

"*He caused those of the People of the Book who helped them (i.e. the Quraysh) to come out of their forts. Some you killed, some you took prisoner.*" [Q. 33: 26](#)

It is in this occasion that Muhammad orders the cutting and burning the trees, and even then Allah would reveal a verse to condone that despicable act.

"*What you (O Muslims) cut down of the palm-trees (of the enemy), or you left them standing on their stems, it was by leave of Allâh.*" [Q. 59: 5](#)

Neither the Quraiza nor the Ghatfans came to help the Bani Nadeer and they were forced to surrender within days and were banished out of Medina. Some left to Syria and some headed to Khaibar. Huyai Ibd Akhtab the new chief of the Bani Nadeer was among those who went to Khaibar. He was murdered few years later when the Prophet invaded the Banu Quraiza and his daughter Safiyah became the booty of the Prophet when Khaibar fell into the hand of the Muslims.

Al-Mubarkpouri writes,

"The Messenger of Allâh (Peace be upon him) seized their weapons, land, houses, and wealth. Amongst the other booty he managed to capture, there were 50 armours, 50 helmets, and 340 swords.

This booty was exclusively the Prophet's because no fighting was involved in capturing it. He divided the booty at his own discretion among the early Emigrants and two poor Helpers, Abu Dujana and Suhail bin Haneef. Anyway the Messenger of Allâh (Peace be upon him) spent a portion of this wealth on his family to sustain their living the year around. The rest was expended to provide the Muslim army with equipment for further wars in the way of Allâh.

Almost all the verses of Sûrah Al-Hashr (Chapter 59 - The Gathering) describe the banishment of the Jews and reveal the disgraceful manners of the hypocrites. The verses manifest the rules relevant to the booty. In this Chapter, Allâh, the All-Mighty, praises the Emigrants and Helpers. This Chapter also shows the legitimacy of cutting down and burning the enemy's land and

trees for military purposes. Such acts cannot be regarded as phenomena of corruption so long that they are in the way of Allâh."

As it becomes obvious and even the Muslim historians are not abashed to admit, no crime is bad as long as it is done in the way of Allah. This was the example that the Prophet left for his followers and this has been the way that the devout Muslims have been acting throughout the history. This perhaps can explain to an uninitiated westerner the inspiration behind Islamic fundamentalism and Islamic terrorism. Islamic violence is not a deviation of the true Islam but they IS the true Islam. Murdering , plundering, raping and assassinating are Islamic practices. Nothing is out of limit when it comes to promoting the religion of Allah.

Ironically, this very Surah concludes by exhorting the believers to be pious and and prepare themselves for the world to come. Which makes one wonder about the twisted mind of its author and the distorted values that he uphold.

We, with our modern sensibility wonder how the followers of Muhammad did not abandon him based on his cruelty and inhumanity. But apparently plundering and looting was the norm, in Arabia. Al-Mubarakpuri writes. "The desert Bedouins living in tents pitched in the vicinity of Madinah, ... depended on plundering and looting as a means of living," This was the way Arabs used to live. When Muhammad used the same techniques to amass his wealth and build his empire, no one raised an eyebrow. This was accepted and everybody did it. In fact when people went to war to bring the booty they prayed to their gods. If they were victorious, they glorified their gods and hailed them as being powerful. Muslims and Muhammad belonged to this primitive culture and had the same primitive mindset. They beseeched Allah, the only idol, for their victories and since Muhammad did not hesitate attacking merchant caravans or unarmed populations he enriched himself and his army very soon. These Arabs attributed his military prowess to the greatness of Allah, What those Arabs believed is not reproachable. They did not know better and this was the only way of life they had ever known. What is tragically deplorable is to see that in this age of science and reason educated people follow the religion of people with such a primitive mentality.

As we saw, if the Bani Nadeer really wanted to kill Muhammad and his few companions, they did not need to make such complicated plans of climbing the wall or throwing a millstone on over their head. He was in their town and they could have killed him easily.

But let us suppose that Muhammad was right and they actually had such plan. Under what law it is allowed to punish thousands of people for a failed murder attempt by a few? Isn't everyone responsible for his own action? What was the crime of those new born children, those pregnant women, those elderly Jews who had to leave everything behind and walk in the desert? How many of those perished? Why the weak ones had to pay for a failed attempt

of a few members of their tribe?

Another important thing to consider is that Muhammad actually assassinated K'ab bin Ashraf the leader of the Bani Nadir; very traitorously. These people, according to their own religion and custom, had all the rights to revenge. Why Muhammad believed that he could go killing all his opponents without any impunity but the simple thought of someone planning to kill him should be punished so severely? What would happen to the world if we all followed Muhammad's example?

I ask Muslims to show me one parallel story in the annals of history of mankind where an entire population of thousands of people was eliminated because of a failed plot of few of them against the life of someone.

A Hadith in [Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 362](#) confirms this story. The narrator talks about the treatment of the Jews of Medina and how Muhammad "killed their men and distributed their women, children and property among the Muslims, but some of them came to the Prophet and he granted them safety, and they embraced Islam. He exiled all the Jews from Medina."

Some Muslim apologists say that the morality of today should not be applied to Muhammad who lived 1400 years ago. They maintain that, "This whole narrative has been problematic for many people because of their notions of what is morally correct and what it morally wrong. The origin of this sickness rests squarely on the Christian mentality of 'turn the other cheek,' and the 'redemptive suffering of Christ,' both of which have been sicknesses in the minds of Europe for centuries on end, until they came to their senses and discarded it."

I don't believe that morality is sickness and it has nothing to do with Christianity either. Morality stems out of human consciousness and its compass is the Golden Rule. We know what is right or wrong when we consider the way we would like to be treated.

By Ali Sina

2- AR-Raheeq Al-Makhtum by Saifur Rahman al-Mubarakpuri
<http://islamweb.islam.gov.qa/english/sira/raheek/PAGE-26.HTM>

3- <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/maududi/mau59.html>

4- <http://islamweb.islam.gov.qa/english/sira/raheek/PAGE-29.HTM>

The Invasion of Banu Quraiza

Banu Quraiza

INVADING BANU QURAIZA:

The next were the Banu Quraiza. Soon after the Battle of the Trench was over, Muhammad claimed that the Archangel Gabriel had visited him "asking that he should unsheathe his sword and head for the habitation of the seditious Banu Quraiza and fight them. Gabriel noted that he with a procession of angels would go ahead to shake their forts and cast fear in their hearts." (2) [Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 443](#)

It is not clear why the Archangel needed Muslim's help to wipe out the Jews if he had "a procession of angels" who would shake their forts. Nevertheless, "the Messenger of Allâh immediately summoned the prayer caller and ordered him to announce fresh hostilities against Banu Quraiza," (2)

Muhammad headed an army of three thousand infantry men and thirty horsemen of *Ansar* (Helpers) and *Muhajireen* (Emigrants).

The Banu Quraiza was attacked for not supporting Muhammad when the Quraish attacked Medina. Ali sworn that he would never stop until he either storms their garrisons or be killed. This siege lasted 25 days. Finally the Banu Qurayza surrendered unconditionally. Muhammad ordered that the men be handcuffed, while the women and children were isolated in confinement. Thereupon Al-Aws tribe interceded begging the Prophet to be lenient towards them. Muhammad suggested that Sa'd bin Mu'adh, a former ally, be deputed to give verdict about them, and they agreed.

Sa'd's verdict who had received as a serious wound in the previous Battle of the Confederates was "that all the able-bodied male persons belonging to the tribe should be killed, women and children taken prisoners and their wealth divided among the Muslim fighters." [Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 280](#)

One wonders why Muhammad who claimed to be the messenger of Allah and in contact with him needed the judgment of a human. Yet this most cruel verdict was precisely what pleased him and he "accepted his judgment saying that Sa'd had adjudged by the Command of Allâh."

Al-Bubarapouri adds that "In fact, the Jews deserved that severe punitive action for the ugly treachery they had harbored against Islam, and the large arsenal they have amassed and which consisted of one thousand and five

hundred swords, two thousand spears, three hundred armours and five hundred shields, all of which went into the hands of the Muslims." (4)

The Muslims historians have been quick to bring the same baseless alibis to justify their raids against their victims like, they were "mischievous", causing "sedition" or being "treacherous" and "harboring against Islam". However no specifics exists as of the nature of those sins to warrant such a sever punishment and their total genocide.

Trenches were dug in the bazaar of Madinah and a number of Jews between six and nine hundred were beheaded therein.

Huyai, Ibn Aktab, the chief of the Bani Nadeer and Safiyah's father was captured in this siege and brought to the Prophet with his hands tied to his neck with a rope. In an audacious defiance he rejected Muhammad and preferred to be beheaded than submitting to his Religion by force. He was ordered to sit down and was beheaded on the spot.

To separate men from the boys, the youngsters were examined and if they had grown any pubic hair, it was enough to behead them.

Sunan Abu-Dawud Book 38, Number 4390

Narrated Atiyyah al-Qurazi:

I was among the captives of Banu Qurayzah. They (the Companions) examined us, and those who had begun to grow hair (pubes) were killed, and those who had not were not killed. I was among those who had not grown hair.

If anyone cannot see that this is NOT how a messenger of God should behave cannot claim to have grasped the meaning of humanness. I believe the cruelty of what the Prophet did to the Jews of Arabia are self-explanatory and any fair-minded person would acknowledge that. It is inconceivable that a messenger of God could kill between 600 to 900 people and banish thousands more with no feelings or compassion.

The man we call the Prophet, was full of hate. He thought of nothing but killing, brought nothing but death, taught nothing but vengeance. Muhammad was not a "mercy of God to mankind" but the curse of devil to humanity. Not only in his life he killed and banished all the Jews he could lay hand on, in his dead bed he instructed his followers to continue with the ethnic cleansing that he had initiated.

Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 288

The Prophet on his death-bed, gave three orders one of them was to Expel the pagans from the Arabian Peninsula.

Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 176

Narrated 'Abdullah bin 'Umar:

Allah's Apostle said, "You (i.e. Muslims) will fight with the Jews till some of them will hide behind stones. The stones will (betray them) saying, 'O 'Abdullah (i.e. slave of Allah)! There is a Jew hiding behind me; so kill him.' "

This man was a hoodlum not a messenger of God, he was a thief, a gangster and a highway robber. He enriched himself with the wealth of his victims.

Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 176

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

People used to give some of their datepalms to the Prophet (as a gift), till he conquered Bani Quraiza and Bani An-Nadir, whereupon he started returning their favors.

If you still believe that Muhammad was a messenger of God. Think to yourself what has happened to your humanity.

I am not going to go into details on the massacre of the Banu Qurayza because there is a great detailed and revealing article on them that you can read in the following link.

What really happened to the Banu Qurayza?

The article in the above link describes the massacre of the Banu Qurayza and the reason why the Prophet chose Sa'd bin Mu'adh as the arbitrator. This is a must read to understand Muhammad and his true character. It should be read in sequence.

Part 1: The siege, the surrender & the intercession of al-Aus

Part 2: Who is Sa`d bin Mu`adh?

Part 3: Appointment of Sa`d bin Mu`adh, his judgment, its execution and conclusions

1- From Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, (1976), pp. 100-107 By W. N. ARAFAT

<http://homepages.hagg.com.au/salam/misc/qurayza.html>

2- AR-Raheeq Al-Makhtum by Saifur Rahman al-Mubarakpuri

<http://islamweb.islam.gov.qa/english/sira/raheek/PAGE-26.HTM>

3- <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/maududi/mau59.html>

4- <http://islamweb.islam.gov.qa/english/sira/raheek/PAGE-29.HTM>